India

FOR THE

No. 131. New Series. No. 225. Old Series. WEEK ENDING FRIDAY, JULY 6, 1900. Registered as a Newspaper. Price ..... 2d. By Post, 2½d.

Notes and News ... 1
The Pressure of Famine ... 4
The Majority Report and Liberal Treatment for India ... 5
Our London Letter ... 6
Notes from Bombay ... 7
The Famine in India:
5,808,000 on Relief ... 7
The Mansion House Fund ... 8
The *Investors' Review* Fund ... 8
Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji at Walthamstow ... 8
The London Indian Society: Annual Dinner ... 9
Indian Affairs in Parliament: Special Report ... 10
The Resolutions of the Lucknow Congress ... 11
Advertisements ... 12

NOTES AND NEWS.

It is always interesting and often instructive for the observer of Indian politics to note how Englishmen deal with critical questions of their own. Thus the treatment meted out to some of the sick and wounded British soldiers in South Africa is to be made the subject of a special enquiry, and even the quasi-official *Times* is quite angry with those who make irrelevant replies to Mr. Burdett-Coutts's charges. On Monday last the *Times* said:—

> These charges are corroborated by much private testimony, which loses none of its weight because there is other testimony favourable to hospital management but referring to other hospitals and other stages of the war. In these circumstances it is quite unjustifiable to impute partisan motives to everyone who declines to accept without demur the optimistic official assurances which are so common and so profuse upon all official transactions as to have lost whatever efficacy they once possessed.

And again on Tuesday the *Times*, discussing the constitution of the proposed committee of enquiry, said plainly:—

> A departmental committee would be merely a whitewashing committee. The public want to know the truth, and it would be too absurd to ask for the truth from the very department whose conduct is called in question.

Those are, we think, notable words. For as England is a trustee for India she is required to show in dealing with Indian interests still greater vigilance than in dealing with interests exclusively her own. It is eminently right and proper that there should be searching enquiry into the treatment of the British wounded in South Africa, and it is gratifying to find the *Times* speaking out so clearly and vigorously on the side of justice, humanity, and common sense. But will not Indians now say to the *Times*: "Come over and help us"? It is not in military matters alone that "optimistic official assurances" are "so common and so profuse upon all official transactions as to have lost whatever efficacy they once possessed." Nor is it only in dealing with the War Office that "it would be too absurd to ask for the truth from the very department whose conduct is called in question." We make a note of these serviceable phrases for future use. For them our best thanks are due to the *Times* and—if it disdain not the tribute—are hereby tendered to it.

The special correspondent of the *Manchester Guardian* (July 3), writing from Bilaspur, in the Central Provinces (May 31), expresses the opinion "that the famine is far from being over, and that there will be a call for further help for a long time to come, no matter how well the monsoon turns out." For such a view of the circumstances we have prepared our readers, taking into full consideration the efficiency of the relief system working at its best. The correspondent reproduces the following extract from a letter written to him by "a Native gentleman of influence, who is held in the highest respect by Indians and Englishmen":—

> There is absolutely no money left with the majority of the cultivators to buy seed, buy or hire bullocks to plough their fields, and to pay the other expenses of cultivation, and to feed themselves and their families between the sowing and the earliest harvest. The Government is distributing 25 lakhs (£166,000) as takavi-loans for agricultural purposes—and the Charity Fund 18 lakhs. But even this sum, which would under ordinary circumstances have been a very substantial help to the cultivators, is, I am afraid, likely to fall very short of the actual requirements of the people. The reports which I have received as secretary to the Central Provinces branch of the Famine Charitable Fund disclose a most serious state of things. Sums which the districts have put down as representing the minimum needs are considerably in excess of what we have been able to give them. For the cultivators are in most tracts simply bankrupts, without cattle, without money, and without credit. How they will get on this time, Heaven alone knows. The very success of the measures adopted to keep the people alive has had the effect of blinding people to a perception of the real condition of our people. No other province in the whole Empire has suffered half as much.

These simple and straightforward words of one that knows intimately the conditions prevailing in the Central Provinces ought to come home with force to the charitable public in this country. How much more ought the appeal to prove effective on behalf of other districts where the famine organisation has been less successful!

The correspondent repeats with increased emphasis his favourable estimate of the relief work in the Central Provinces, which has been wisely planned and energetically executed by Mr. Denzil Ibbetson, the Chief Commissioner. He again points to the stress that has been laid on village works. Thus:—

> In this division alone (Bilaspur), something like a thousand village tanks have been dug, deepened, or repaired, a job that has given employment to nearly half the able-bodied people on relief. See what this means. The people have been left at peace in their own homes, free to keep an eye on their fields and cattle and to look after the old folks and the children, and ready to rush to the lands directly the rains begin; and they have been employed at a kind of work which they all appreciate, because they know its inestimable value. . . . . It is the nearest possible approach to a system of automatic relief work, and it has been an unqualified success.

"With the system of village works, and kitchens, and the provision of famine camps on a larger scale where the need exists," says the correspondent, "it has been possible to dispense almost entirely with that most unsatisfactory of relief agencies, the famine poorhouse." Mr. Monteath's official contention that "it has never been considered a matter of primary importance to make famine labour productive" has been happily ignored in the Central Provinces. The correspondent concludes:—

> If you want to demoralise the people, then by all means set them building vain altars—of broken metal or useless earth—to a fetish of pauperism which has no earthly relation to the facts of Indian life.

But evidently, in spite of all the good example of the Central Provinces, there hangs over the mind of the correspondent the ominous gloom of the awful question of the future—"the doom of recurrent famines that seems to have been pronounced against India." He says:—

> I say "seems," but the sentence is ringing in the ears of all who have ears to hear. Even the *Pioneer*, which stands for what is optimistic in the official mind, declares that famines must be regarded as a recurrent evil, and that, as such, provision must be made to meet them. Remember that these famines, with only a year between them, have set their teeth in the land, and that the people, who were incredibly poor in 1896, are poorer now than the beasts in the jungle, and it will be seen that even with the kindliest of monsoons a quick recovery is not to be hoped for. In many districts it will take a generation to get over the shock and loss of this year of horror, and we can hardly hope that the monsoons, which have been bewitched of late, will fall back into their old regular ways for the whole period of this perilous convalescence.

This depressing forecast corresponds with the anticipations of the special correspondent of the *Daily Chronicle*, which we quote in another column. What a startling contrast to the recent official and journalistic chorus over the "prosperity" and "elasticity" of India. What a trumpet call to the British people to investigate the facts and take timely action.

By means of large figures Lord Onslow gave an aspect of generosity to his reply to Lord Sandhurst's question (July 2), "whether, in view of the unprecedented severity of the famine and the great distress which must for some time continue after the bursting of the monsoon, the

Government of India had in contemplation any extension of the system of relief beyond that laid down in the Famine Code." "The Government of India," said Lord Onslow, "has already far exceeded the prescriptions of the Code," and has adapted them to differing local needs; and he put his best foot foremost by citing the sensible arrangements in the Central Provinces—village and home relief, kitchens, and so forth. Then there were advances to the rayats for subsistence, seeds, and cattle; and there were large suspensions of revenue. The Budget arrangement of 50 lakhs had been more than doubled—to an aggregate total grant of Rx.1,225,000. "No interest," he said, "will be asked for the advances, at any rate for a year, and the Provincial governments will have the utmost latitude to remit any portion of an advance they may think fit." The Earl of Aberdeen intervened between question and answer with a broad suggestion that Scotland at least would welcome large liberality on the part of the Government. But this pointed to a national grant, and Lord Onslow reaffirmed the sufficiency of the financial resources of the Government of India.

A million and a quarter of tens of rupees—say £800,000 sterling, good—is not a sum to be sneezed at in these days of widespread distress. But then, let it be noted, it is only an "advance"—a loan, not a gift—and will remain a burden on the wretched rayats. Surely the wiser course would be to start them with a free gift, and with a ray of hope for the darkling future. True, they are to be free from "interest," "at any rate, for a year." That is to say, the moment they appear to have any surplus, the revenue officers will be down upon them; and though Lord Onslow parades a lordly freedom permitted to the Provincial Governments to remit here and there—a parade that dazzles the eyes of the unenquiring Britisher—it is but too well known how little likely is the path of clemency to be widely adopted. Besides, the whole principle of a loan is most obnoxious in the dire circumstances of the time. What is wanted is a generous gift from the British Parliament, a gift worthy of the British people. Not "to the Indian Exchequer," nor yet to the Mansion House Fund, but to the Viceroy on behalf of the afflicted people of India, for administration on the charitable lines of relief supplementary to the action of the Indian Government. New Zealand, Trinidad, and other Governments have had no difficulty—formal or otherwise—in sending their contributions; why should the Imperial Parliament alone be paralysed? By the way, what has become of the Canadian purpose of liberality? Has Lord George Hamilton stifled that too, as he has damped down the benevolence of the public at home? He, the very Minister that ought to have asserted the claims of India, has restrained his colleagues, thwarted the sense of Parliament, and chilled the public kindliness. For cannot India bear yet another instalment of debt?

Mr. Balfour, we are glad to observe, has answered Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman more softly than he answered Sir William Wedderburn last week on the subject of the date of the Indian Budget debate. In reply to Sir William (June 21), he was understood to say that it would be taken "at the ordinary time." In reply to Sir Henry (July 3), "he hoped it would come on before the ordinary date, which was after the third reading of the Appropriation Bill, but he was not in a position to say on what day it would be taken." We trust Sir Henry will keep the point in mind, and that Mr. Balfour will endeavour to realise his "hope." All that is needed is a little business management, with firmness. Even such a small attention as a slight acceleration of the debate would be welcomed in India as a symptom of more serious interest.

Without professing to examine here the various points in Mr. R. Carstairs's article on "Famine in India" in the *Asiatic Quarterly*, we think it well to note his idea of "grain banks"—an idea that grew out of his own practical experience. He says:—

> Some seven or eight years ago there was a scarcity, and, to help the tenants of a particular estate in my charge, we advanced about 230 maunds of grain (a maund is about 80 lb.) to some of them, on condition that for every maund advanced they should return after harvest a maund and a half. This is the customary rate charged in ordinary times by private creditors. The advances were duly repaid and the proceeds stored. After deducting the cost of storage and watching the whole stock was redistributed on the same terms next season. Year by year distribution and recovery were made, until, on taking the last account, I found we had in our granaries upwards of 4,000 maunds. There had been a famine year, and the only difference we made was to take back $1\frac{1}{4}$ maunds instead of $1\frac{1}{2}$ maunds for each maund advanced. We had practically no bad debts and no law suits.

No more than Mr. Carstairs do we see anything to prevent the establishment of "grain banks" like this all over the country. Mr. Carstairs, indeed, "anticipates the day when there will be a network of local authorities overspreading rural India, and each of these will be managing one or more grain banks." Still, though Mr. Carstairs offered this grain bank of his to Government "as a going concern, with substantial capital and no debts," he is not yet aware "whether the offer was accepted." There lies the eternal difficulty in any attempt to improve the chances of the cultivators. Only the present famine should open the Government's understanding.

As to the causes of Indian poverty there are great differences of opinion. The leaders of Indian thought are wont to look in the first place to the great drain on the country, the twenty millions sterling or so sent annually to Europe without economic return to pay Home Charges, etc., etc., and secondly, to the increase and rigid collection of the land revenue, the almost necessary result of the expensive system of government established in the country. On the other hand, the Anglo-Indians pin their faith to the supposed over-population of the country, though, as has been often set out in these columns, statistics give them very little support. There is, however, one source of poverty that is common ground to both, viz., the undeveloped state of Indian industrial life, and the consequent employment of the great mass of the people on one industry alone. Where the whole, or nearly the whole, population depends on the land, as in Ireland, in India, and over the greater part of Russia, there poverty is always found; and though the poverty of India is too deep to be attributed to this cause alone, it can hardly fail to be due to it in some measure. Some have been found to claim this as a new discovery of the opponents of the National Congress, but the repeated resolutions of that body show that its leaders are fully alive to the importance of industrial development, and were so long before many of its present advocates had touched the question.

The *Pioneer* contains a thoughtful and suggestive article on the subject entitled "The Development of Indian Industries." That journal is inspired with good hope by the recent speech of Lord George Hamilton, in which he, gaining at last some inkling of the truth, spoke of the famine as "not only a food but a wage famine," and therefore looked upon the multiplication of industries in India as "a primary duty" of the Government. By implication the want of varied industries is the chief cause of famine. The *Pioneer* is a little doubtful whether the "primary" meant business or rhetoric, and its hopes that the Government would take the reorganisation of industry in hand are somewhat dashed by his Lordship's further remark about the "supply of electrical power to the homes of the workers," which, as our contemporary says,

> opens up so vast a question of national expenditure on reproductive works that it is doubtful whether any Secretary of State would have the courage to sanction it.

But whatever may be thought of Lord George Hamilton's speech, the article in the *Pioneer* is certainly well worthy of attention. In its view there are two main lines which must both be followed by the Government if Indian industries are to be effectively encouraged. The first is the removal of all those obstructions which the red-tape of officialism is so ready to put in the way of industrial development, and which are all the more likely to be found in India because there the official classes are so powerful. "Easy and helpful mining laws," for instance, are needed for the proper expansion of the mining industry. The second is the abandonment of the cast-iron attitude adopted ever since the time of Lord Cross, by which the Government in no case engages in trade, and when it accidentally becomes possessed of a business works it merely to pay expenses until such time as it can be sold.

One point of great interest is raised by the *Pioneer* in this connexion. Of all the possible shackes on Indian

industry, the one that would receive the most support from public opinion at home would be a legal curtailment of the hours of labour. English working-men who would readily grant the Indians all the benefits of a fair field object to the Indians gaining an advantage by longer hours. The *Pioneer* considers that there is a danger of this feeling being exploited by English manufacturers to the disadvantage of India, and that regulations concerning the hours of labour may be imposed on the workers there which the industrial conditions do not justify. It contrasts the power of concentrating his work possessed by the English or American workman with the more leisurely ways of the Indian :—

> He is good at steady, persistent plodding, but he must plod at his own pace, and he must get his work in here and there, and stand out for a minute now and then, or he will not work his best. He deliberately prefers to take ten hours over a job which would take an Englishman only eight, and he works distinctly better when allowed to go his own way, or at any rate to work in his own time.

In other words, he is in an earlier stage of industrial development than his fellow-worker in England.

We are glad to notice Mr. G. P. Pillai's able and temperate "Plea for the Indians in South Africa" in the current (July) number of the *Asiatic Quarterly Review*. The subject has been fully dealt with in these columns, and Mr. Pillai adds no fresh points only because there are none to add; but it is specially opportune to gather together the main facts of the case, and to press for their just recognition in the impending re-settlement. This is what Mr. Pillai has done now, and he has done it with admirable completeness, fairness, and effectiveness. Reviewing the general Indian attitude to the war, he seems to join in the regret that "for certain political reasons" —he does not enquire what these were—"Indian soldiers were kept away from the field of battle." For the rest, he remarks :—

> Nevertheless, Indians have only been found too ready and willing to render all possible aid in other directions. Princes and people came foward with magnificent offers of help. While Princes gave away thousands, and some even lakhs of rupees, in aid of the war fund, the poor ill-paid sepoy to whom the privilege of the battlefield was denied found solace in the voluntary contribution of a month's pay towards the war. And the Indian clerks, and traders, and coolies in South Africa, quite innocent of the practice of handling a rifle, served, albeit heroically, in the humble capacity of stretcher-bearers. Amongst the din and turmoil of the war, all race animosities, all distinctions of colour, were forgotten, and the swarthy Indian and the hard-visaged Colonial worked nobly together, to uphold the supremacy of the British Empire in South Africa.

"Will all this be forgotten when the war is over?" Mr. Pillai asks. With him, we trust not.

The Indian population in South Africa is very considerable, and all testimony goes to show that it consists of inoffensive, hard-working people. There are about 57,000 Indians in Natal; about 10,000 in Cape Colony; about 5,000 in the Transvaal (at least before the war), and a small number in the Orange Free (now River) State. It is sufficiently obvious how valuable, in an economic sense, such an element of the population might be, under equitable laws and regulations. We will not now follow Mr. Pillai in his review of the past maltreatment of British Indians in the several provinces of South Africa. We will rather look forward to the hopes of a new dispensation, more favourable to these fellow-subjects of ours, and more creditable to the Imperial Government and to the British people. "We all desire," said Mr. Chamberlain to an Indian deputation on the subject a few years back, "that all British subjects should be treated alike, and should have equal rights and privileges." Lord Salisbury, speaking at the Guildhall banquet last year, declared that what he desired was "equality for all races" in the Transvaal; and presumably he would extend this equality to all the other divisions of South Africa. The Indians themselves always keep in mind the great promises of the Proclamation of 1858; and Mr. Pillai naturally concludes that "it is the bounden duty of her Majesty's Ministers to see that those noble and generous words of her Majesty with reference to her beloved Indian subjects are not rendered meaningless in South Africa." Mr. Chamberlain is no longer confronted with his chief difficulty—the difficulty of interfering in the internal affairs of self-governing colonies; and there ought to be no doubt that he will now seize the opportunity of performing a signal act of justice to the British Indian subjects of the Crown throughout the British possessions in South Africa.

A correspondent of the *Pioneer*, "T. D. M.", writing on the Cawnpore riots, complains that "day by day the whole Government machinery is passing into the hands of Natives!" with a consequent loss of efficiency. Nay, the educated Natives, wicked men that they are, approve of this, and even clamour for its extension, while no European, save "T. D. M.", is ready to say them nay. He gives a terrible case where all the officials of a district were Indian, save only the District Superintendent of Police. But if India is becoming more and more ruled by her own people—and if this progress goes on in spite of all attempts to bar the way to Indians, by economic pressure alone, is it not necessary to look the situation in the face? Which is the best way to bring out the good and repress the evil in the Indian servants of the Government—to tell them that, however able and public-spirited, they can never rise to the highest posts, and must always be treated as an inferior race, or to tell them that the highest honours are open to them according to their deserts?

It is, however, generally admitted that the police force stands in great need of reform. The postal officials can be honest judged by our European standards—for the losses in the Indian Post Office due to dishonesty are proportionately less than in the Post Office at home. But whether from evil tradition, from a sense of power, or from the fear which the rigid processes of European law inspires in the Indian, the police lend themselves to corruption and extortion in a way which loudly calls for reform. This is the tenor of a vigorous article in the *Englishman*. It is a point on which Indian and Anglo-Indian agree.

The *Mahratta* raises a strong protest against the conduct of Mr. Aston, Sessions Judge at Poona, who in a recent criminal trial there not only expressed his dissent from the unanimous verdict of the jury, but cross-examined them as to their reasons for their decision, and not being satisfied with their answers, said: "I cannot compliment you on your intelligence, and I scarcely have had a more worthless opinion to record." That judges disagree with juries is an event not unknown in this country, but since the celebrated case of Regina *v.* Mead and Penn they have generally done so with civility. As readers of INDIA are aware, there have been several cases in which the High Court, on appeal, have upheld the verdict of the jury and expressed their concurrence with it in opposition to the Sessions Judge.

Rameswar, convicted by the District Magistrate of Patna, of obstructing public servants in the discharge of their duty on the occasion of the Dinapar riots, was sentenced to one month's rigorous imprisonment. He appealed to the High Court, and the *Amrita Bazar Patrika* reports the decision. The prisoner was held to be properly convicted, but as although there was evidence of his having opposed the police, he supported the Magistrate on his arrival and did his best to cause the crowd to disperse, the sentence of imprisonment was reduced to a fine of Rs. 50. As the Magistrate admitted that the plague measures which led to the riot were harsh, this leniency seems quite justifiable.

In spite of the quiet which has settled down on the North-West frontier, there is still one source of disturbance, the persistent activity of the Waziri rifle thieves. The disarmament of the tribesmen, which we were told would be the grand result of the last frontier war and the expeditions into the territories of the tribes, is still very far from being accomplished. The demand for fire-arms among them is very great, high prices are given, and thus daring spirits are tempted to run great risks. The *Pioneer* declares :—

> It is practically impossible to prevent surprises being sprung occasionally on small patrols, or to successfully beat off an attack upon a post held by a handful of men.

Our contemporary says that it is very difficult to fix responsibility on any section of the tribe, yet it suggests that the headmen should be called together if this state of things continues and told that a policy of leniency is no longer possible. Leniency apparently consists in not punishing the innocent for the faults of the guilty.

THE PRESSURE OF FAMINE.

THE famine still rages. The numbers in receipt of relief indeed are reported as somewhat diminished during the past week, the advent of the rains apparently drawing some of the miserable people back to their homes. The monsoon, however, "continues weak, giving cause for anxiety." It is not yet sufficient "for general resumption of agricultural operations." And "even after abundant rain has fallen throughout the distressed districts relief will be necessary on a large scale, until early crops ripen." There is still a long and dreary period to be struggled through. Meantime cholera, the natural attendant of famine, is ominously busy. Mortality is reported "still deplorably high" in certain districts, "though every precaution has been taken to meet the emergency"—which, we suppose, means that the officials are doing what they can with the actual cases, not that every means of prevention was duly taken by the Government. The Central Provinces are acknowledged to be "ravaged by cholera, 6,500 persons having died in May"; and the Simla correspondent of the *Times* expressly states (July 1) that "the epidemic is severest in the tracts suffering from acute famine," as might have been expected. The Viceroy's telegram, while carefully stating that the European supervising staff is "reported sufficient," admits "strain great and breakdowns not infrequent." There is something of the nature of a contradiction here. "*Reported* sufficient" must be taken by home readers, as it would seem intended to be taken, in the sense of "*is* sufficient"; and yet there seems to be a painful inconsistency between a sufficiency of staff and "breakdowns not infrequent." One cannot but read into the expression of the Viceroy a confession of inability to cope adequately with the situation. How much better it would have been, in every possible aspect of the matter, if the authorities had frankly taken the people of this country into their confidence from the first, and appealed to them on a plain unvarnished statement of the unparalleled facts of the calamity.

The breaking of the monsoon has diverted part of the Government relief—"large" part, indeed—to the villages and homes of the distressed cultivators. We were led to expect that the Government would deal very liberally with the poor people at this stage of the crisis. "Government advances," runs the Viceroy's telegram, "are being freely given for purchase of plough bullocks, seed, and subsistence, poorer cultivators receiving gifts from Famine Fund." This is as it ought to be, in the circumstances; yet, as we have already insisted, it would have been a much wiser and a vastly less expensive charity to prevent the exhaustion of the rayat's resources and keep his bullocks in life. Where are the cultivators to obtain sufficient bullocks for the farm work now awaiting them? The independent reports of newspaper correspondents, and even official admissions, leave no doubt that the stock of cattle has been at least decimated everywhere, in most famine districts much more than decimated, and in some considerable tracts almost entirely swept away. It is months and months since we noted the multiplied truck-loads of hides sent down country; and there has been a continuous stream of evidence as to the mortality of all kinds of cattle. As we write, there comes to hand the Paris *Figaro* with a despatch from the distinguished author, Pierre Loti, written in the end of May from Jaipur. Take one or two sentences :—

> These dying people are rayats of the plain in which the pink-and-white city (Jaipur) stands. Since the time when the monsoon did not break, they have been struggling against the drought, and now own themselves beaten. Their cattle are dead. They have sold the hides for next to nothing. The fields they sowed are burnt up, and they have sold their clothes, their silver rings, their bracelets and anklets, and now implore for food.

In like manner, the special correspondent of the *Daily Chronicle* (July 2), writing from Jodhpur (May 31), says of Marwar :—

> For scores of miles you can journey through a khaki waste, broken only where a few stunted trees struggle with the inhospitable soil, or a little prickly pear maintains a lonely existence, without meeting with a sign of cultivation; whilst the bleached bones of hundreds of oxen, the rotting carcases of the indispensable camel, bear witness to the destruction of live-stock. . . . . If ever a land bore famine writ broad in every natural feature, it is this unhappy country. Verily the abomination of desolation is here.

"The hard case of Marwar," he says, "is paralleled by the whole of Western Rajputana." And the description would not require any modification to render it applicable to a very large tract of strictly British Indian territory, and not any very substantial modification for any part of the whole famine-stricken area. It is but too easy to understand what the Simla correspondent of the *Times* means when he reports that the famine expenditure "continues unchecked, involving a serious drain on the resources of the Government."

"A serious drain on the resources of the Government," it is too often forgotten, is a serious drain on the resources of the taxpayer. For the purposes of payment, it is the taxpayer that is the Government; and the biggest taxpayer is the agriculturist, who has been so heavily smitten by famine and its train of scourges of disease. Previous sharp experience has warned the Government to be generous now in its attempt to re-establish the rayat; for the Government has to look to the future, and knows how much depends upon its land revenue collection. Of course the charitable contributions of the world will help in their degree, but they will unhappily go but a very short way. In this country they have sustained a lamentable series of checks from the first—checks initiated by the highest authorities and emphasised to the public by the fatal authority of an insufficiently instructed or a recklessly subservient Press. We did our best at the moment to warn our countrymen against hasty acceptance of rose-coloured views of the condition of India; and now the special correspondent of the *Daily Chronicle*, who, it is to be noted, is also the special correspondent of the two great Anglo-Indian journals, the *Times of India* (Bombay) and the *Englishman* (Calcutta), writes in these emphatic terms:

> It was an evil day for India when some Secretariat official, whose purview was limited to revenue returns and balance-sheets, invented those most leading phrases: "the marvellous recuperative power of the Indian people," "the gratifying elasticity of the Indian revenues." The cry has been taken up by every machine politician from Land's End to John o' Groat's, until the impression is general in Great Britain that it needs only a single good year to bring prosperity and contentment to famine-stricken India, and wipe out the influence of widespread crop failure. A passing acquaintance with any famine area will show how entirely the contrary is the case. Take, for instance, the State of Marwar. . . . . The State will emerge from the crisis saddled with an enormous load of debt, and with the certainty of diminished revenues for at least a decade. . . . . I might multiply indefinitely the directions in which famine on a grand scale presses sorely upon this brave people. At least a generation will elapse before its baneful influence is eradicated.

Yes, but Marwar expects a famine every eight years—two famines in a generation. How, then, is it to recover? And what is true for Marwar is also substantially true for British India proper. It is to be hoped, therefore, that the British people, as well as the Government of India, will at last grasp the real facts of the situation, and bring adequate succour to the rayats at this critical moment on which the future is so seriously dependent.

If the Government of India is to fulfil its promise of liberal assistance to the rayat, it must plainly, even with the freest gifts of charity from without, exhaust its own coffers at no distant date. There still remains, however, its boasted "credit," which means, in point of fact, the popular belief, grounded on official acknowledgments as well as on obvious political considerations, that the Home Treasury stands behind it. This ultimate guarantee, for which the British taxpayer is practically bound, ought to awaken us to a more vivid interest in the situation created for us by our "responsible" representatives. But Lord George Hamilton confidently tells the House of Commons that the Government of India has still in hand powers of borrowing up to nine millions sterling. It is not for him to remind his hearers that the British public are the sureties for all this money, much less to impress upon them the danger of the guarantee. The Deluge may not come in his period of office. But one would really expect that the Front Bench of the Opposition would bring up a statesman who should expose clearly the trend of Indian finance and the desperate political conditions that the existing policy is creating for us, as well as for the Indian people. Another million or so of debt does not look very important in comparison with the immense sum already piled up, but the effect of the addition is quite another matter.

It ought not to need much insistence to satisfy business people that a further plunge into debt by a debtor already mortgaged to the eyes and hopelessly unable to lighten his load is scarcely the most statesmanlike method of relief. Especially wrongheaded does the expedient appear when there is a friend standing by who is ready and willing to make the unfortunate rayat a free gift in seven figures,

if the rayat's official guardian would only permit the benevolent act. It was a regrettable slip when Sir Henry Fowler asked about a national contribution to "the Indian Exchequer." Sir Henry should be careful not to give his friend Lord George Hamilton a horse to ride off on. What is asked for is not a contribution to the Indian Exchequer, but a contribution to the funds devoted to charitable work in supplement of the restricted action of the Government of India. It is nothing less than a public scandal that the Indian authorities should determinedly refuse to avail themselves of a willing British national grant, in view of the awful suffering it might prevent or mitigate, and in view of the gloom that lies over the future of Indian finance and Indian politics. But it is for the public themselves to speak their mind on the subject now, or to hold their peace when the day of reckoning comes at last. More than that: India's claim may well be based on the justice, as well as on generosity, of the British nation. For what is £293,000—the annual sum admitted by the Indian Expenditure Commission to be in effect overcharge —to the "millions on millions" that represent the true indebtedness of this country to India?

THE MAJORITY REPORT AND LIBERAL TREATMENT FOR INDIA.

As has often been said in these columns, the Report of the Majority of the Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure does not err on the side of violence. It represents the opinion of moderate men, for the most part officials, disinclined to drastic changes, and with no tendency to overrate the evils of the present system. To this body the Government of India submitted a statement of the payments for services in which both England and India were interested, and a claim for liberal treatment. Although this claim was not allowed in every instance, it has received sufficient support from the Commission to give it a new strength, and to inspire the people of India with a new hope that some instalment at least of financial justice will at length be paid to them.

In the first place, it is to be noted that the Majority Report, while it has in several cases recommended that the share of the United Kingdom should be increased, has never suggested that India should pay in greater proportion. In no single instance is it suggested that India has been paying too little; in several instances it is admitted that she has been paying too much. Is not this a most serious reflection on the method by which the joint charges have been hitherto apportioned, and on the justice and the generosity of the more powerful nation? In every case where a readjustment of charges has been recommended it is in favour of the weaker partner.

Again, the Report quotes with approval the recommendations of the Select Committee of the House of Commons on Indian Finance, which sat in 1874, and this Committee had come to the same conclusion—that, however little the Home Government wished to lay charges on India which really should have been borne by England, this had happened in several instances. This Committee, indeed, went still further, and saw in the control of the House of Commons a means of securing financial justice. They agreed in the opinion, which had been "very emphatically expressed by the Marquis of Salisbury, that the most effectual way of securing financial justice for India was for the House of Commons to be constantly watchful on her behalf." The Committee went on to say:—

> They cannot lay down too strongly the position that the English estimates should not be relieved at the expense of the Indian revenue, but that the Secretary of State for India in Council has the constitutional right of refusing to pay for objects in which he considers that India has no interest.

These views are accepted in the Majority Report, which says: "We concur in the views of the Committee, and we are mainly guided by them in the opinion which we express." Among the recommendations of this Committee was one to the effect that "'care should be taken to consult the India Office upon proposed changes which may affect India." Twenty-one years afterwards, in 1895, the Government of India drew up a list of charges "imposed upon the Indian revenues in consequence of orders from the War Office issued in all cases without the concurrence of the Government of India."

There is one point, indeed, on which both this Committee of the House of Commons and the Majority of the Royal Commission lay considerable stress, and which it is well to notice, as it may be used as an excuse for burdening India with charges unnecessary to her own defence. India is a component part of the Empire, and therefore must be prepared to bear her share of Imperial burdens. Now, if this be so, if it be right and proper that India should contribute to the cost of maintaining the Empire, it must either be with or without her consent. If she is to be consulted as to what enhancements of her expenditure are necessary for Imperial purposes, there is nothing more to be said. But if she is not to be consulted, if her share of Imperial burdens is to be imposed by the Government of the United Kingdom, then in common fairness and decency the other parts of the Empire must contribute also in proportion to their wealth. If rich and prosperous Australia contributes what she chooses and when she chooses to the expense of maintaining the Empire, on what plea of justice or common honesty can India, the prey of pestilence and famine, the poorest of civilised countries, be asked to pay in greater proportion and against her will? If India is a fit subject for Imperial charges, at least let there be one weight and one measure, and let all parts of the Empire contribute equally in accordance with their capacities.

The Indian Government, in the valuable statement they supplied to the Commission, give many reasons for considering the presence of the English army in India such a benefit to the Empire from a military point of view that India should be, in part at all events, relieved of the burden. Most of these reasons are answered at length in the Report of the Majority. Some of these advantages are held not to be proven, others to be of greater benefit to India than to the Empire. Thus in the case of the military reforms of the last thirty years, though it is admitted that such measures as the abolition of purchase and the introduction of short service imposed additional expenses on India, it is maintained that India has been compensated by the greater military efficiency attained. This may or may not be so, but it is not denied that these reforms were introduced without any special reference to India's needs, and that India has had to pay for advantages, if they be advantages, which she would certainly never have sought.

In one point, which opens up the whole question of the drain on India's resources involved in the payments she has to make in Europe, the opinion expressed by the Majority of the Commission challenges some notice. The Indian Government, much understating their case, in that they left unnoticed the economic effects on the country's trade of payments made without *economic* return, complained that as the pensions granted to European officers and soldiers were for the most part laid out at home, the advantage of the expenditure was reaped by the United Kingdom. The Report, while allowing that there is some force in the argument, thus meets it:—

> But these pensions are part of the consideration paid for the service which the soldier has already rendered. The Indian Government employs the soldier for a certain remuneration, present and deferred. The deferred pay or pension is part of the contract, and when the soldier has performed his stipulated service he is entitled to the pension which formed part of the contract with him. He is at liberty to spend that pension when and how he pleases, and India is not entitled to claim that it ought to be spent in India.

Now, this is to confuse two totally different things. No-one proposes to break faith with the existing soldiers. It is urged that the cost of the Indian army is too great for that country to bear, and it is answered that you must not deprive the soldiers now serving of the pensions already promised. It is argued that India loses through so much money being drained from India to pay the pensioners, and it is answered that they may spend their pensions where they like. The question is, Should so large and so many pensions be granted in the future? Should not the number of European troops be reduced? Should India have to pay for reforms, like the abolition of purchase, which have increased the pension list, and about which India was never consulted? If the number of European troops stationed in India be more than is really necessary for the maintenance of internal order and for the defence of the frontier, then it is quite pertinent to ask if it is fair to make India pay the additional burden which is caused by those troops spending their pensions out of the country.

The Report of the Majority insists that India and the United Kingdom should be considered as independent

political entities, India making the best bargain it can for the troops necessary for its purposes. This seems an entirely fictitious theory; the more so as it is admitted that, in one important respect, England gains by the presence of this large army in India for which India pays :—

But the Home Government has derived and does derive great benefit from the existence of a large effective force in India. The Empire has great and varied interests in the Eastern seas; and although military authorities do not consider that the permanent garrison of India should be reduced below the present number, yet it is possible for India, in time of peace, to lend troops temporarily for Imperial purposes. India has done so repeatedly.

And it is admitted that she has had occasion to lend troops to us much more often than we have had to supply special aid to her. Do not the recent events in South Africa and China dispose at once of the theory that the troops in India exist for India alone? Do not they call for liberal treatment to that unfortunate famine-stricken country? Do they not demand a new partition of military burdens between the two countries?

OUR LONDON LETTER.

WESTMINSTER, Thursday.

COMEDY seems strangely out of place among the tragic realities of the Indian famine; otherwise one might be tempted to smile at the grotesque asseverations of the India Office to the effect that the victim is doing as well as can be expected. A Spanish hidalgo would die of starvation rather than confess his poverty, and we all remember Scott's description of how Caleb Balderstone, though sore at heart over the bareness of the family cupboard, publicly magnified the resources of his *cuisine*. Some spark of the same perverse spirit of pride appears to have entered into the breasts of her Majesty's Ministers for India. They refuse to acknowledge the poverty of that unhappy country. "The famine is not a question of money," said Lord George Hamilton a few days ago; and last Monday, echoing his chief's words, Lord Onslow assured the House of Lords that the resources of the Indian Government were "sufficient for the purpose required." Lord Sandhurst, who had raised the question, remained obviously unconvinced by the borrowed optimism of the Under-Secretary, while Lord Aberdeen looked as if he would have liked to enlighten the peers by reading to them some of those private letters in which, as he said, were contained descriptions of the famine even more vivid than those published in the newspapers. But what could be done? Pride or policy continues to interpose an insuperable barrier between the Indian Exchequer and the Imperial Treasury, and there is no indication that the wall will ever be breached.

Meanwhile, the process of draining the Indian garrisons to fight the battles of Europe in China goes on apace. Speaking on Tuesday in the short debate on the Chinese crisis Mr. Brodrick elicited the cheers of the House of Commons by recounting details of the various reinforcements which are to be sent from India to Taku to uphold the prestige of Britain against the Celestials. Our army in South Africa numbers between two and three hundred thousand men, but although Pretoria has now been occupied for more than six weeks the time has not yet come when Lord Roberts can release a single soldier. The public mind, distracted by the perils of the situation in the Far East, has almost lost sight of the progress of events in the Transvaal. Some critics say that this is fortunate for the Government, others that it is a stroke of bad luck. When all is said and done, it will probably be found that the effect of the protracted suspense in the one case and of the agonised apprehension in the other has been of a cumulative rather than of a neutralising character. Even among loyal Ministerialists in the House of Commons traces of the weariness born of over-excitement and reaction are becoming more and more visible.

Apart from Mr. Brodrick's welcome testimony to the harmony of the various Powers in China, the debate of last Tuesday was chiefly remarkable for Mr. Pritchard Morgan's vigorous nomination of Li Hung Chang as future ruler of the Empire. The terms of the hon. member's recommendation were distinctly novel. Among the qualifications attributed to the Viceroy of Canton were his "pro-foreign" tendencies. "He is the most pro-foreign statesman in China," his eulogist asserted. Moreover, Li Hung Chang had always been the guardian of the heir-apparent to the throne; his mere name struck terror into the hearts of his countrymen; and if he were to declare against the Manchu dynasty he would be supported by a rising of the Cantonese. As if to show how experts and travellers may differ, Mr. Joseph Walton immediately supplemented Mr. Morgan's prescription by a suggestion to the effect that Li Hung Chang, "this astute Chinese statesman," should be held responsible in purse and person for any outrage committed on foreigners in the district within his jurisdiction. Happily, the Government offered no encouragement to either the one proposal or the other.

"When in doubt, play trumps." Applying the axiom to politics Mr. Balfour translates it, "When in difficulty, appeal to party." Sometimes, the device is justified by success. On the eve of a critical division there is nothing like it. Again and again has the Conservative leader rallied waverers to his side not by the arts of persuasion or the force of argument but simply by throwing the party gauntlet on the floor and with many a resounding, if hollow period, defying his political opponents to come on. How is it possible for the average partisan to resist the war-cry of his fathers? At such a moment he feels that it would be disloyal to reason why. He lets the hot blood surge about his brain and makes into the lobby regretting that his weapon of offence is merely a vote instead of a good claymore. With the morning come the newspaper reports with the glowing embers of the night's passion preserved in the form of cold, grey ashes. The disillusion may be inevitable, but so long as it follows the division a party leader need have no compunction. His little trick has served its turn, and so it will again.

But not always. Mr. Balfour made one of the great mistakes of his leadership the other night, when he attempted to meet Mr. Burdett-Coutts's indictment against the management of the military hospitals in South Africa by representing the agitation as a manœuvre, inspired by mere party spleen. To begin with, his followers found it difficult to persuade themselves that Mr. Burdett-Coutts had for years been masquerading as a true-blue Tory simply to reveal himself at last as a treacherous and unscrupulous Radical. Political memories are proverbially short, but even the most accommodating of Ministerialist minds could not erase the recollection of Mr. Balfour's admission, made only twenty-four hours earlier, that public feeling had been rightly and properly stirred by Mr. Burdett-Coutts's disclosures and that an opportunity of debate ought to be provided forthwith. Nor was it easily possible to reconcile with the theory of blind party spite, Mr. Wyndham's sad confessions that the revelations of the member for Westminster were "true to a lamentable extent." Nevertheless, Mr. Balfour, driven to desperation, could think of nothing better than to raise the slogan of his clan. It was wonderful to see with what an impulsive eagerness the clansmen responded to the signal—pathetic to witness the unaccustomed promptitude of their return to reason and the consequent faltering in their leader's note of high defiance.

One of the shrewdest of the Irish members, commenting afterwards on Mr. Balfour's display of fiery indignation, said it was the cleverest thing he had seen for years. It was undoubtedly a very skilful piece of histrionics, but from the tactical point of view the whole performance was a blunder. Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman brought a stream of cold commonsense to bear on the oration which had the effect of making the Government look ridiculous in the eyes of their own supporters. Moreover, there was no division, with a big Ministerial majority, to break the anti-climax. This, in short, was a case in which the embers of passion were dead almost as soon as they had been brought to a glow. An appeal to party prejudice is always ignoble, but when it falls flat it becomes humiliating.

Owing, perhaps, to the almost undeviating consistency of his support of the Government in its administration of Indian and African affairs, Sir Henry Fowler has come to be regarded by many Liberals as a somewhat lukewarm champion of their views. Nevertheless, Sir Henry is quite capable on occasion of speaking out and of putting his opponents to confusion. The other night Mr. Wyndham astonished the House of Commons by laying down the dictum that the question of publishing Sir George White's Ladysmith despatches was a matter for Lord Lansdowne to decide, and that enquiries on the subject would produce no statement from anybody else. "Do you mean to say," demanded Sir H. Fowler, "that the House of Commons is to be refused all information on this important matter?" The

question was at once so unexpected and so aggressive in tone that the hapless Under Secretary, gasping with surprise, at once capitulated and explained that his meaning had not been clearly understood.

NOTES FROM BOMBAY.

THE FAMINE AND THE MONSOON.

THE CONDITION OF THE RAYAT.

[FROM AN INDIAN CORRESPONDENT.]

BOMBAY, June 16.

The rains are still holding off in the Bombay Presidency. The forecast of the official meteorologist is that we shall have no burst of the monsoon here till the 20th at the earliest. People are in a state of anxious suspense. Even when the monsoon is upon us, it will not be possible to say what will be its general character. That will only be established by the fall the various districts have by the end of July or the middle of August. Statistics tell us that the largest fall is always in that month, and it is the certain index which establishes the nature of the season—whether it is an average one, light, or deficient. Meanwhile, Mr. Elliott, the official meteorologist, has issued an elaborate memorandum which is instructive both to men of science and to practical agriculturists. In order to forecast with a fair amount of certainty the nature of the annual monsoon, it is observed that the condition of the flow of the Nile is extremely important. It is now gradually dawning on those who have to prognosticate Indian weather on a scientific basis that they should take account of the physical phenomena at varying seasons in West and South-East Africa. The rise of the Nile, it is stated by Mr. Elliott, is a fair criterion of an abundant monsoon in India, as its opposite foreshadows the contrary. This is the most important factor in future prognostications regarding the monsoon. Next, are the trade winds on the Indian Ocean and in the tropics? Lastly, there is the snowfall in Northern India. The whole paper is an informing one.

Meanwhile there are about a million of persons on relief works in the Presidency. How they will fare between monsoon and harvest time is the question of the day. Of course the Government of late has been liberal in respect of its *taccavò* advances, which will enable the cultivating classes of the districts, now grievously suffering from famine, to eke out subsistence. But it is to be hoped that the Government will exercise a wise discretion in converting these advances into a free gift later on. These men have lost their all. Their only capital, the agricultural plough, is gone. The mortality among the cattle is simply appalling. Between 1893 and 1897, the Gujerat and the Deccan have lost 12 per cent. of these. And it is impossible to conjecture what loss the prevailing famine has entailed. Without capital and without credit, the cultivator can do nothing. And if the *taccavò* advances are to be ultimately repaid to Government, he will have next to nothing left at harvest time, let alone his old indebtedness to the *sowcar*. Surely, it is the part of wisdom at this juncture to give him a fresh start in his agricultural career. But if it is to be an unencumbered one, so far as the State is concerned, the State should be generous. It should not ask him to repay the advances on account of the purchase of seeds, plough and plough cattle; but convert them into a free gift. This will put heart into the rayat, who will then have some further stimulus in his tilling operations. And if at the same time the Government allows liberal remissions of arrears of revenue, there is hope of a resuscitation of the rayat. It is his labour that enriches the State. Therefore, it is the duty of the State to be this time generous and forego a larger part of the revenue due.

At a rough calculation, it is estimated that the revenue from the two districts sorely afflicted comes to about two crores. During the famine of 1896-97, Sir Antony MacDonnell with the sympathy which characterises his attitude towards the cultivating classes, remitted 75 lakhs out of an arrear of 147 lakhs. This is equal to 50 per cent. But there was no heavy cattle mortality during that famine. It is estimated that the current one is even more severe than the last and unprecedented in its intensity. Under the circumstances, instead of a remission of 50, one of 75 per cent. is called for by the necessities of the cultivator. If released from all State demands, both of revenue and of *taccavò*, the cultivator would not doubt be able to stand on his legs. Some hope of improving his material condition would revive in him. Otherwise, the rayat will be worse off for a few years after the famine is gone. He will be ground down even more than he is at present between the upper millstone of the taxgatherer and the nether one of the usurer. Is that a condition to be viewed with equanimity? Is that a condition to which the State should reduce the rayat? When we bear in mind that it is upon the industry and productivity of the rayat that the entire land revenue of the State depends —a revenue equal to one-fourth of the total gross revenue of the empire—it will be seen how imperative is the necessity for the State to come forward and help him.

This seems to be the prevailing opinion of men of light and leading, European and Native, in the Bombay Presidency. It is to be hoped that the Bombay Government will prove equal to the occasion, and recommend the Government of India to remit a large portion of the arrears of revenue. Lord Curzon himself declared some months ago how terrible in its consequences was this famine. It is, therefore, expected that he will readily accord his sanction to such liberal remissions as the Bombay Government may ask for. In Lord Curzon and Lord Northcote we have fortunately a couple of administrators of the greatest sympathy for the poor famine-stricken cultivator. Hence there is every expectation that both will discharge the duty they owe to these hapless men in this hour of unprecedented distress. Humanity as much as State expediency demands the utmost generosity, and Bombay will be rejoiced to see that that generosity is shown without delay. *Bis dat qui cito dat.* For in this matter time also is of the essence of the question.

THE FAMINE IN INDIA.

5,808,000 ON RELIEF.

The Secretary of State for India has received the following telegram from the Viceroy on the subject of the famine:—

Rainfall has been fairly general during past week, but the monsoon current continues weak, giving cause for anxiety. Frequent showers have fallen in parts of Central Provinces, Mysore and Bombay, Deccan, Madras, Berar, Hyderabad, but rainfall to date insufficient for general resumption of agricultural operations. Little or no rain has fallen in North-Western India. In anticipation of rainy season, work near villages and home gratuitous relief are being largely substituted for large works. Government advances are being freely given for purchase of plough bullocks, seed, and subsistence, poorer cultivators receiving gifts from Famine Fund. Even after abundant rain has fallen throughout the distressed districts, relief will be necessary on a large scale, until early crops ripen.

Excluding deaths from cholera, there has been no serious increase in the death-rate in Central Provinces. Mortality still deplorably high in several Bombay, Berar districts, though every precaution has been taken to meet the emergency, and fresh outbreak of cholera reported; dysentery, fever prevalent. European supervising staff reported sufficient, but strain great and break-downs not infrequent.

Numbers of persons in receipt of relief:—Bombay, 1,362,000; Punjab, 166,000; Central Provinces, 1,789,000; Berar, 516,000; Ajmere-Merwara, 146,000; Rajputana States, 492,000; Central India States, 167,000; Bombay Native States, 458,000; Baroda, 91,000; North-Western Provinces, 2,000; Punjab Native States, 34,000; Central Provinces Feudatory States, 57,000; Hyderabad, 500,000; Madras, 14,000; Kashmir, 1,000; Bengal, 13,000. Total, 5,808,000.

The following telegram has been received from the Governor of Bombay:—

Following are figures for week ended June 23:—

Famine-stricken districts.—11,309 cases of cholera, of which 6,669 were fatal. Native States.—Cases of cholera, 11,084; deaths from cholera, 6,722. Total number of deaths among numbers on relief works and gratuitous relief in British districts, 4,728 or 3 4-9 per mille. Some rain has fallen in affected districts of Bombay, Deccan, and Khandesh, and has had the effect of considerably reducing number on relief works. Want of rain causing anxiety in Gujarat, where numbers on relief works continue to increase and numbers on gratuitous relief are increasing.

THE MANSION HOUSE FUND.

The Mansion House Fund for the relief of the Indian famine sufferers amounted on Wednesday night to £313,400. The Lord Mayor during the day remitted a further sum of £9,000 to Lord Curzon for relief purposes.

THE "INVESTORS' REVIEW" FUND.

We take the following from the current issue (June 30) of the *Investors' Review*:—

Subjoined is the list and amount of subscriptions received for our little fund up to date. May we again repeat that it is a fund, every farthing of which will be put to good uses, especially in helping the starved cultivators to replace their lost cattle, and that the more help we can give in this direction the sooner will the distressed provinces and Native States—for they cannot be forgotten in the present misery—recover some of their ancient prosperity? Cheques and postal orders should be drawn to A. J. Wilson, crossed Union Bank of London, Famine Fund Account.

List of Subscriptions.

	£	s.	d.
Amount acknowledged last week	£680	5	0
E. B...	1	0	0
Mrs. Haydn Morris, Abergele	0	10	0
Chalmette	1	0	0
Total to date	£682	15	0

Remittances should be made to Mr. A. J. Wilson, *Investors' Review* office, Norfolk House, Norfolk Street, Strand, W.C.

MR. DADABHAI NAOROJI AT WALTHAMSTOW.

"INDIA MUST BE BLED."

[From Our Own Reporter.]

Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji addressed a meeting held on Sunday last, July 1, at the United Methodist Free Church, Markhouse Road, Walthamstow, in aid of the Indian Famine Relief Fund. Mr. Peter Troughton occupied the chair.

The Chairman, in opening the proceedings, said the Indian Famine was a subject of very great interest to all Englishmen, and he was sure they would all gladly welcome some authentic information on the subject. He would therefore ask Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji to start his speech right away. (Applause.)

Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, who was received with cheers, said:—Mr. Chairman, I feel exceedingly pleased at having to address so large a meeting of English ladies and gentlemen. I assure you it is a great consolation to me that English people are willing to hear what Indians have to say. I will make bold to speak fully and heartily, in order that you may know the truth. I will take as a text the following fine words, "As India must be bled." These words were delivered by a Secretary of State for India, Lord Salisbury himself. I want to impress upon you what these important words mean. Let us clearly understand what is meant by bleeding a nation. It is perfectly true that when government is carried on people must pay taxes. But there is a great difference between taxing a people and bleeding a people. You in England pay something like fifteen shillings of taxes per head per annum. We in India pay only three to four shillings per head per annum. From this you may conclude that we must be the most lightly-taxed people in the world. That is not the case, however; our burden is twice as heavy as yours. The taxes you pay in this country go from the hands of the taxpayers into the hands of the Government, from which they flow back into the country again in various shapes, fertilising trade and returning to the people themselves. There is no diminution of your wealth; your taxes simply change hands. Whatever you give out you must get back. Any deficit means so much loss of strength. Supposing you pay a hundred million pounds every year, and the Government uses that money in such a way that part only returns to you, the other part going out of the country. In that case you are being bled, part of your life is going away. Suppose out of the hundred million pounds only eighty million pounds return to you in the shape of salaries, commerce, or manufactures. You will have lost twenty million pounds. Next year you will be so much the weaker; and so on each year. This is the difference between taxing people and bleeding people. Suppose a body of Frenchmen were your rulers, and that out of the hundred million pounds of taxes they took ten to twenty million pounds each year; you would then be said to be bleeding. The nation would then be losing a portion of its life. How is India bled? I supposed your own case with Frenchmen as your rulers. We Indians are governed by you. You manage our expenditure and our taxes in such a way that while we pay a hundred million pounds of taxation this hundred million never returns to us intact. Only about eighty million returns to us. There is a continual bleeding of about twenty millions annually. Ever since you obtained territorial jurisdiction and power in India, in the middle of the last century, Englishmen and other Europeans that went to India have treated that country in the most oppressive way. I will quote a few words of the Governor-General of India at the time to show this. "The vast fortunes acquired in the inland trade have been obtained by the most oppressive conduct that ever was known in any country or age." The most oppressive means were adopted in order to bring away from the country enormous quantities of wealth. How was the Indian Empire obtained by you? It has been generally said that you have won it by the sword, and that you will keep it by the sword. The people who say this do not know what they are talking about. You have not won the Indian Empire by the sword. During these hundred and fifty years you have carried on wars by which this great Empire has been built up it has cost hundreds of millions of money. Have you paid a single farthing of it? You have made the Indians pay every farthing. You have formed this great British Empire at our expense, and you will hear what reward we have received from you. The European army in India at any time was comparatively insignificant. In the time of the Indian Mutiny you had only forty thousand troops there. It was the two hundred thousand Indian troops that shed their blood and fought your battles and that gave you this magnificent Empire. It is at India's cost and blood that this Empire has been formed and maintained up to the present day. It is in consequence of the tremendous cost of these wars and because of the millions and millions you draw from us year by year that India is so completely exhausted and bled. It is no wonder that the time has come when India is bleeding to death. You have brought India to this condition by the constant drain upon the wealth of that country. I ask any one of you whether it is possible for any nation on the face of the earth to live under these conditions? Take your own nation. If you were subjected to such a process of exhaustion for years, you would come down yourselves to the condition in which India now finds herself. How then is this drain made? You impose upon us an immense military and civil service, you draw from us a heavy taxation. But in the disbursement and the disposal of that taxation we have not the slightest voice. I ask any one here to stand up and say that he would be satisfied if, having to pay a heavy taxation, he had no voice in the government of the country. We have not the slightest voice. The Indian Government are the masters of all our resources, and they may do what they like with them. We have simply to submit and be bled. I hope I have made it quite clear to you, that the words of Lord Salisbury which I have quoted are most significant; that the words are true and most appropriate when applied to India. It is the principle on which the system of British government has been carried on during these 150 years. What has been the consequence? I shall again quote from Lord Salisbury. He says: "That as India is to be bled the lancet should be directed to the parts where the blood is congested, or at least sufficient, not to those parts already feeble from the want of it." Lord Salisbury declared that the agricultural population, the largest portion of the population of India, was feeble from the want of blood. This was said twenty-five years ago; and that blood has been more and more drawn upon during the past quarter of a century. The result is that they have bled to death; and why? A large proportion of our resources and wealth is clean carried away never to return to us. That is the process of bleeding. I ask any one of you whether there is any great mystery in these dire famines and plagues? No other country exhausted as India has been exhausted by an evil system of Government would have stood it half the time. It is extraordinary that the loyalty of the Indians who are bled by you is still so great. The reason of it is that among the Hindoos it is one of their most cherished and religious duties that they should give obedience and loyalty to the powers that govern them. And they have been loyal to that sentiment, and you have derived the benefit of it. It is a true and genuine loyalty. But do not expect that that loyalty cannot fail, that it will continue in the same condition in which it is at the present time. It is for the British to rouse themselves and to open their minds, and to think whether they are doing their duty in India. The theory maintained by statesmen is that India is governed for the benefit of India. They say that they do not derive any benefit from the taxation. But this is erroneous. The reality is that India, up to the present day, has been governed so as to bring about the impoverishment of the people. I ask you whether this is to continue? Is it necessary that, for your benefit, we must be destroyed? Is it a natural consequence, as it is a necessary consequence? Not at all. If it were British rule and not unBritish rule which governed us England would be benefitted ten times more than it is. (Cheers.) You could benefit yourselves a great deal more than you are doing if your Executive Government did not persist in their evil system, by which you derive some benefit, but by which we are destroyed. I say let the British public thoroughly understand this question, that by destroying us you will ultimately destroy yourselves. Mr. Bright knew this, and this is an extract from one of his speeches. He said: "By all means seek your own benefit and your own good in connexion with India; but you cannot derive any good except by doing good to India. If you do good to India you will do good to ourselves." He said there were two ways of doing good to yourselves, either by plunder or by trade. And he said you would prefer trade. Now, I will explain how it would benefit you. At the present time you are exporting to the whole world something like three hundred millions worth of produce a year. Here is a

country under your control with a population of three hundred millions of human souls, not savages of Africa. Here is India, with a perfectly free trade entirely under your control, and what do you send out to her? Only eighteen pence per year per head. If you could send goods to the extent of £1 per head per annum India would be a market for your whole commerce. If such were the case you would draw immense wealth from India besides benefitting the people. I say that if the British public do not rouse themselves the blood of every man that dies there will lie on their head. You may prosper for a time, but a time must come when you must suffer the retribution that comes from this evil system of government. What I quoted to you from Lord Salisbury explains the real condition of India. It is not the first time that English statesmen have declared this as absolutely as Lord Salisbury has done. During the whole century Englishmen and statesmen of conscience and thought have time after time declared the same thing, that India is being exhausted and drained, and that India must ultimately die. Our misery is owing to this exhaustion. You are drawing year by year thirty millions of our wealth from us. The Government of India's resources simply mean that the Government is despotic and that it can put any tax it chooses on the people. Is it too much to ask that when we are reduced by famine and plague you should pay for these dire calamities? You are bound in common duty to humanity to pay the cost of these dire calamities with which we are afflicted. (Great applause.)

At the conclusion of Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji's address a collection was made on behalf of the famine relief fund, and the meeting ended, as it had begun, with devotional exercises.

THE LONDON INDIAN SOCIETY.

ANNUAL DINNER.

[From Our Own Reporter.]

The annual dinner of the London Indian Society took place on Thursday, June 28, at the Restaurant Frascati, Oxford Street. Dr. S. K. Mullick presided, and amongst those present were: Sir W. Wedderburn, Bart., M.P., Mr. Pickersgill, M.P., Professor A. F. Murison, Mr. W. Martin Wood, Mr. J. M. Parikh, Mr. S. Zeanddin A. Balkhi, and Mr. Asutosh Das, the honorary secretary.

The Chairman in proposing the toast of "The Queen-Empress" said they knew how kind and how good she had been to their country and what a good ruler she had been throughout the Empire. Not long ago he had a message from the Queen's own lips to convey to the people of India, or rather, such of the people of India he might have the opportunity of addressing in a public character. Speaking in reference to the famine, her Majesty said "I have had losses in my own family, and I can appreciate the losses that have occurred in the family of others. When you have an opportunity of addressing your countrymen, or letting them know in any way my sentiments towards them, please express to them the fact that my sympathies are with them; and especially at this dark hour of peril and need I sympathise with the women of India." (Cheers).

Letters expressing regret at inability to be present were read from a number of gentlemen, including Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji.

Professor A. F. Murison, LL.D., proposed "India and the Indian National Congress." He said they found themselves lamenting the deplorable condition that India had fallen into under an attack of famine still more terrible than anything on record in that distressful country—a famine so terrific as to cast entirely into the shade the serious ravages of the plague, and in whose track had come cholera, smallpox, and many other distresses. He thought everybody would admit that the British officials at all events had been doing their duty manfully in combating the famine and the plague, and he did not doubt for a moment that the Native officials had been playing their part disinterestedly, ably, and successfully. (Hear, hear.) He did not wish to make any serious reflection upon the Government, but he did think it was an unfortunate thing that the Government of India should have limited so very strictly and sternly the extent of its operations in face of the terrible situation that had arisen. A noble effort had been made to save life and to enable the rayats to get on their legs again after the famine was over, but a man might be saved for the moment from absolute starvation to carry in himself the seeds of very early death. It seemed to him that in a terrible emergency like this the first thing to do was to save lives in the most thorough-going sense—(hear, hear)—and that the best and most profitable plan would have been to pour out money as far as it was needed and not to have stayed to draw a distinction as to the exact amount of destitution in which the particular persons that sought relief were at the moment. It appeared that this was not a famine in the ordinary sense of the word. He understood there was plenty of food in the country and no difficulty in bringing it to the people who wanted it. The difficulty was that the people had no money to pay for the food when it was brought to them. In his opinion we ought as a nation to give sufficient money to rescue all that were in distress, and, having done that, see that measures of prevention were taken at the earliest moment. (Cheers.) Pressing for measures of prevention was the one thing those interested in the future of India ought to keep in view, for that was the only way of striking at the root of the evil. Very decided progress was being made by Indians in England not only in the Inns of Court but in the Universities. Last year they had to congratulate themselves upon a senior wrangler, Mr. Paranjpye, and this year they narrowly missed another, Mr. Balak Ram. In a variety of subjects it was clear that Indians were distinguishing themselves in a marked degree in competition with our own men in the Universities. He hoped all those gentlemen who came here would endeavour not only to outstrip their English competitors, but also to make themselves acquainted with our ways, our modes of thinking and feeling, and go back again with a determination to utilise this knowledge in such a manner as to forward the prosperity of their own country. (Cheers.) Referring to the Congress, he said there was no doubt it had done an immense work in drawing together all classes and castes of India and making them feel their fellowship—in impressing the idea of nationality, in fact. (Cheers.) In England too not only the people but the newspapers were taking a more intelligent interest in the Indian question than they did a few years ago. That change had been caused mainly by agencies and organisations connected more or less closely with the Indian National Congress. (Cheers.) While the case for India had strong friends in this country, he hoped their friends in India would not forget that it required the united efforts of both to overcome the experience of retired Anglo-Indians and the determined resistance in official circles. (Cheers.)

Mr. S. Zeauddin A. Balkhi responding for India associated himself with the deep sympathy expressed by Professor Murison for the sufferers from the famine. No doubt the people of this country had shown their sympathy in every possible manner so far as they had estimated the situation in India, but they had not a proper idea as to how serious the famine really was. The Mansion House Fund and the donations from Germany and other parts of the world were merely a few drops in the river, and it seemed to him that without a direct substantial grant from the Imperial Exchequer the Government would not be able to combat the evils of famine, plague and smallpox. He did not think there would have been such terrible misery and so many deaths if the Government had only listened to the wise suggestions of the great champion of India, Sir William Wedderburn. (Cheers.)

Sir William Wedderburn responded for "The Indian National Congress." He said that being an ex-president of the Congress, and having been present at its birth, he took a parental interest in its welfare. The Congress had its work both in India and in this country, but the key of the Indian situation was here. (Cheers.) The opinions held and declared by the Congress were those of the whole educated classes of India, and the question was how those opinions were to be brought to bear in this country. The three directions in which it must be done were in Parliament, in the Press, and upon the public platforms. The British Committee of the Indian National Congress had for many years been doing their best to work in all these three directions. (Cheers.) Now that the "Grand Old Man of India" (Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji) was no longer in the House of Commons, he was sorry to say he was the solitary representative of the British Committee there. Mr. Naoroji was much respected in the House of Commons, and he was sure everyone would be glad to see him back again. (Cheers.) The line he had taken in the House of Commons was to state, as far as he could, what he believed to be the main view of Indian affairs. He did not say the Indian view of Indian affairs was always the right one, but it was above all things important that the people of this country should know what that view was. The Indian people know where the shoe pinched, and he claimed for Indian opinion, so far as he had voiced it in the House of Commons, that it had been shown to be right in the principal burning questions that had come before Parliament. The first great question with which they came into collision with official India was the Frontier War, which he thought had been pretty generally admitted to be a great mistake. The second great question on which they differed from the official view was with regard to the plague—and the origin of the disturbances in Bombay and Poona. He thought, although a good deal of blame was thrown upon them at the time, that it had been proved that it was a mistake to employ European soldiers in the work of segregation, and that a little care and prudence and more regard for the feelings of the people would have prevented those disturbances. The third matter in which they had always been at issue with the official version was as regards the condition of the rayat. Secretaries of State for India had habitually talked about the increasing prosperity of the rayat. If the rayat had always been increasing in prosperity he must be a very fat man now; but instead of that he was a mere starving. How could it be said that the rayats were prosperous when they were dying by thousands because they could not tide over the failure of a single harvest? But whether the opinion of the Indian people was right or wrong, it was the business of the Government to know what that opinion was. It was impossible to administer a country properly unless the feelings of the people were known; and the more the feelings of the people were known, the more the Government would understand the loyal and kindly nature of the people. Making the people prosperous and contented was the only solid foundation of any government, and the criticisms made by the educated Indians were for the benefit of the Government so that they might know what the needs of the people were. (Cheers.) He had always maintained that the interests of this country and India were absolutely identical—(hear, hear)—and the greatest enemies of this country or of India were those people who tried to sow suspicion between the two nations. (Hear, hear.) There were in South Africa some very dangerous people whose business it was to "smell out witches." When any person incurred the anger of a great chief this witch-finder appeared and smelt out this person who was immediately put to death. He believed those who smelt out sedition in India were equally foolish. (Cheers.) The business of the Congress had been to bring to light all grievances and if possible to discover the remedy. The result had been that all those who were members of the Congress had widened their sympathies. The Congress did not recognise any distinctions of caste, or creed, or race; they were all brothers together and their wish was to make India prosperous. They wished to cultivate good relations between the rulers and the ruled, and they believed the connexion of India with this country was necessary for

the education and progress of the country, and that those were the true friends of India who did their best to let the wishes of India be known and to help this country to meet those wishes and do all they could to make India prosperous. (Cheers.) He wished as far as possible in the House of Commons to give expression to the opinions and feelings of the people of India, and they made him believe he had their confidence. (Hear, hear.) He was very proud of that. But at the best he was an outsider and what they wanted in the House of Commons was to have their own man there. Mr. Naoroji did a great work in the House and more men like him should be sent to it. Then they wanted a brilliant orator like Mr. Surendra Nath Banerjea who, it was suggested, should challenge Lord George Hamilton in his own constituency. At present this country was full of sympathy for the Indian people, and if Mr. Surendra Nath Banerjea were to oppose the Great Mogul of India and try and turn him out of his political position, he would get the ear of the civilised world, and that was a thing which should not be lost sight of. (Cheers.)

Mr. J. S. Naidu, proposing "The Land we live in," advised Indian students who had come to England to study the ways of the English, to understand their thoughts and to carry them out when they get back to India. He believed that if only the people who were creating ill-feeling between the English and the Indians would stop doing so, there would be no danger to India from any country. (Cheers.)

Mr. Martin Wood, in reponse, expressed the hope that Indians who went back to their own country would look upon themselves not only as subjects of the Queen-Empress but as fellow-citizens of the greatest empire of modern times.

Mr. Mukerji in proposing, "The London Indian Society," said he had watched its progress since he came to London in 1886, and he advised its members to learn the lessons which had given the Britishers the largest empire in the world.

Mr. M. Garbutt responded, dwelling on the fact that the Society taught them to assimilate and take advantage of the forces that were acting upon them.

Mr. N. B. Wagle proposed "Our Guests" and expressed a hope that the Indian Budget debate would be taken as soon as possible before the House of Commons emptied.

Mr. E. H. Pickersgill, M.P., in the course of his reply, said his heart responded to the great idea of a British empire, but it must be an empire founded upon justice, righteousness and fair play. (Hear, hear.) He paid a warm tribute to the self-sacrificing devotion of the Indian stretcher-bearers in South Africa, and hoped the Society's next meeting would be under better circumstances for the empire of India.

Mr. J. M. Parikh proposed "The health of Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji," and enumerated some of that gentleman's numerous services to India. Mr. Naoroji, he said, had rendered devoted services to India, not only outside the House of Commons but in it. He was the first gentleman to show that such a thing as the election of an Indian member of Parliament could be accomplished. They all knew how he got a Royal Commission from the Government. As a member of that Commission he had to overcome many difficulties to be able to put the Indian view before the Commission, but eventually they saw the fruits of his labour in the Minority Report. (Cheers.) It had often been said that the educated Natives of India did not really represent the true sentiments of the Indian people; but he should like to ask, If those who were born and had lived among the rayats did not know their sentiments and requirements, who did? Mr. Naoroji truly represented the Indian cause, as was evidenced by the magnificent reception he received as president of the Congress. (Cheers.)

The health was drunk by the company upstanding, and the Chairman, on behalf of Mr. Naoroji, said that it would be a proof to him of the great esteem in which he was held by their community, and that when his health permitted they would weclome him back even more heartily than before.

Mr. Balkhi proposed the health of the Chairman and alluded to his scientific attainments.

The Chairman in returning thanks said they were surrounded by friends, but if they wanted help they must show they were deserving of it by every effort to work out their own salvation.

Mr. Balkhi asked the company to drink to the health of their energetic Secretary, Mr. Das, who by his example had given encouragement to future secretaries of the Society. There had lately been a lack of activity on the part of the members of the Society, but Mr. Das had changed their luck.

Mr. A. Das, in returning thanks, said that the consciousness of doing his duty to his own country stimulated him to do what he could for the Society. He had the greatest delight in serving the Society and their motherland, India.

A photograph of the company was then taken by lime-light.

Imperial Parliament.

Thursday, June 28.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE RAILWAYS REPORT.

East India (Railways),—Copy presented,—of Administration Report on the Railways in India for 1899-1900, by F. R. Upcott, Esq., C.S.I., Secretary to the Government of India, Public Works Department, Railways [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

"PREVENTIVE" INOCULATION.

East India (Inoculation against Cholera and Typhoid),—On the motion of Sir Charles Cameron an Address was granted for "Return of Correspondence relating to preventive inoculation against Cholera and Typhoid in India."

JUDICIAL AND EXECUTIVE DUTIES.

Mr. Herbert Lewis asked the Secretary of State for India whether a memorial in favour of separating judicial from executive functions was forwarded to the Government of India in July, 1899, for consideration and report:

And, whether any, and, if so, what report on the subject had been received from the Government of India.

Lord G. Hamilton: The Memorial to which the hon. member's question refers was forwarded to the Government of India in August, 1899. I have not yet received the Government of India's report upon it.

THE TROOPS FOR CHINA.

Mr. Channing asked the First Lord of the Treasury, whether the cost of sending additional troops from India to China was to be borne by the Indian or the Imperial Exchequer.

Mr. Balfour: It will be borne by the Imperial Exchequer.

THE G.I.P. RAILWAY BILL.

Great Indian Peninsula Railway Company Bill,—The Chairman of Ways and Means, in pursuance of Standing Order 83 relating to Private Bills, informed the House that in his opinion the Great Indian Peninsula Railway Company Bill, though unopposed, ought to be treated as an opposed Private Bill.

Monday, July 2.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

THE FAMINE IN INDIA.

Lord Sandhurst asked the Under-Secretary of State for India whether, in view of the unprecedented severity of the famine and the great distress which must for some time continue after the bursting of the monsoon, the Government of India had in contemplation any extension of the system of relief beyond that laid down in the Famine Code.

The Earl of Aberdeen said any announcement on the part of the Government in the direction indicated in his noble friend's question would be welcomed in Scotland. There were a great many Scotchmen in India, and their friends in Scotland had received many private letters containing descriptions of the horrors of the famine more vivid than those published in the newspapers. The result was that in Scotland it was hoped and even anticipated that the Government might be contemplating some action beyond what had been already announced.

The Earl of Onslow said that he was not sure that he apprehended rightly the exact nature of the aim of the noble earl, but he rather gathered that he referred to some kind of grant from the Imperial Exchequer to assist the Government of India. The statement had already been made to Parliament that her Majesty's Government would come forward with assistance if they were satisfied that the resources of the Government of India were insufficient for the purpose. As far as they knew at present those resources were sufficient for the great demands made upon them. Of course an enormous amount depended on the result of the monsoon, which had just burst, and therefore it would be impossible for her Majesty's Government to give any promise or to foreshadow what their action might be until they knew what was likely to be the condition of affairs during the coming rainy season. The Government of India had already far exceeded the prescriptions of the Code, which were elastic and not rigid, and had been adapted by the Government of India to the differing local requirements to the entire satisfaction of the local Governments concerned. For example, in the Central Provinces a very large number of kitchens had been opened, which would feed all comers during the rains, and the aged and infirm would be relieved at home. The able-bodied labourers would be given local employment by the village headmen at the cost of the State wherever private demand for fixed labour was slack. Sixty lakhs of land revenue had been suspended out of the 86 demanded. This sum, added to the 27 lakhs special advances and the 35 lakhs of charitable relief, would, in the Chief Commissioner's opinion, secure active agriculture during the rains. Similar relief measures during the rains had been adopted elsewhere. In Bombay the Government were extending the kitchens and gratuitous lists, and they were granting to the rayats advances for the subsistence of themselves and their labourers till next crop. They estimated 25 lakhs as the amount required for this, besides over 60 lakhs for seed and cattle. Of the Bombay land revenue only 102 lakhs out of 296 had been collected. In the Punjab the small farmers and labourers would receive subsistence, and the revenue suspensions there were very large. The noble lord had asked him a question as to what were the estimates the Government of India had formed of the amount they would have to advance. These estimates, the earlier estimates, had been considerably increased. In the Budget arrangements 50 lakhs of rupees had been allocated, but the Government of India recognised that this sum was insufficient, and the sum at the disposal of the central committee would have to be increased. The requirements of the approaching season would be met by an additional

72½ lakhs; accordingly the grants would be increased to an aggregate total of Rx. 1,022,000. The central committee of the Indian Famine Fund had made grants aggregating 50 lakhs of rupees. He hoped the noble lord would see that the suggestion he had thrown out that advances should be made with no niggardly hand had been adopted by the Government of India. No interest would be asked for them, at any rate for a year, and the provincial Governments would have the utmost latitude to remit any portion of an advance they might think fit.

Tuesday, July 3.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE TROOPS FOR CHINA.

Sir J. Colomb, on behalf of Sir Ellis Ashmead-Bartlett, asked the Under-Secretary of State for War, whether General Sir A. Gaselee was now on the way from India to China with the Indian contingent:

And, whether General Gaselee would command the allied forces on land in China.

Mr. Wyndham: General Sir A. Gaselee has been appointed to the command of the Indian contingent and is on his way to China. The last part of the hon. member's question raises issues of importance altogether beyond the scope of the department which I represent.

"THE MILITARY FORCE OF THE EMPIRE."

Mr. Drage asked the First Lord of the Treasury, whether any attempt had been made to ascertain the views of the Colonial and Indian Governments on the reorganisation of the Military force of the Empire:

And, whether the Government would consider the desirability of adding to the Committee of the Council of Defence representatives of the great self-governing Colonies and of India.

Mr. Balfour: The Committee has been established and the Government cannot therefore at this stage alter either its constitution or the scope of its enquiry.

THE INDIAN BUDGET DEBATE.
TO BE "CONSIDERABLY ADVANCED."

Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman: I wish to ask the First Lord of the Treasury if he can tell us what will be the business to-morrow and on Thursday, and I would venture to remind him of the Indian Budget. Public attention has been directed to Indian questions generally, and I think he seemed disposed a few days ago to give some consideration to it.

Mr. Balfour: As regards the Indian Budget, my right hon. friend is perfectly correct in saying that I am anxious to advance the ordinary date upon which the Indian Budget is taken. That, as the House is aware, is on the third reading of the Appropriation Bill, which, during this Parliament, has come on in the second week in August. I hope to considerably advance that date, but I am not yet in a position to say exactly what day it will be convenient for the House to allocate to that purpose.

THE INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS.

THE RESOLUTIONS PASSED AT THE FIFTEENTH SESSION, LUCKNOW, DECEMBER 28, 29, AND 30, 1899.

We print below a first instalment of the full text of the Resolutions that were passed at the last Session of the Indian National Congress. We commented on the main topics at the time of the Lucknow meeting and immediately afterwards, and now we give the Resolutions in full for convenience of reference:—

Resolution I.

Resolved that this Congress notices with satisfaction the support of public opinion both in England and in India, which the question of the separation of the judicial from the executive functions in the administration of justice has received; and this Congress, while thanking Lord Hobhouse, Sir Richard Garth, Sir Richard Couch, Sir Charles Sargent, Sir William Markby, Sir John Budd Phear, Sir John Scott, Sir Roland K. Wilson, Mr. Herbert J. Reynolds, and Sir William Wedderburn for presenting a petition to the Secretary of State in Council to effect the much-needed separation, earnestly hopes the Government of India will give their earliest attention to the petition which has been forwarded to them, and will take practical steps for speedily carrying out this much-needed reform.

Resolution II.

Resolved (*a*) that this Congress regrets the introduction into the Supreme Legislative Council of a Bill to amend the Law relating to agricultural land in the Punjab, with a view to restrict alienation of land as proposed in the Bill by sale or mortgage, which is calculated: (1) to decrease the credit of the agriculturists and landholders; (2) to make them more resourceless on account of their inability to meet the ever-increasing State demands upon their land; and this Congress is of opinion that the provision to give retrospective effect to the Bill is inequitable and unfair.

(*b*) That this Congress recommends that real relief be afforded to the cultivating classes in the following way: that where the Government is the rent-receiver, the rule proposed in 1882, prohibiting any enhancement except on the ground of rise in prices, be enforced, and that where private landlords are the rent-receivers, some provision to prohibit undue enhancement of rent be made.

(*c*) This Congress further resolves that a Committee, consisting of the President, Mr. Jaishi Ram, Mr. N. Gupta, Mr. Wacha, Munshi Madho Lal, Mr. Madhulkar, and Mr. Ikbal Shanker, be appointed and empowered to submit a representation to the Government, pointing out the unsuitable nature of many of the provisions of the Bill.

Resolution III.

Resolved that whereas it is considered safe and prudent to withdraw large bodies of British troops for service outside the statutory limits of India, this Congress is of opinion that the time has come when the Indian taxpayer should be granted some relief out of the British Exchequer towards the cost of maintaining in India so large a force of European soldiers. This Congress sees no objection to the location of British troops in India as a reserve force for the whole of the British Empire, but is of opinion that the time has come for the transfer of the cost of 20,000 British troops from the Indian to the British Exchequer.

Resolution IV.

Resolved (*a*) that having regard to the fact that the principal cause of the loss by Exchange is the steady growth of the demand on the Indian Exchequer for expenditure in England, this Congress regrets the introduction of a gold standard in India on the recommendation of the Currency Committee for the purpose of preventing loss by exchange, and is of opinion that the new measure is calculated to increase the gold obligations of India.

(*b*) That this Congress is further of opinion that the decision accepted by the Government will, in effect, add to the indebtedness of the poorer classes in India, depreciate the value of their savings in the shape of silver ornaments, and virtually add to their rents and taxes.

(*c*) That this Congress is further of opinion that the decision accepted by the Government is likely to be prejudicial to the indigenous manufactures of the country.

Resolution V.

Resolved that this Congress is of opinion that the union of the military and civil medical services is extravagant, inconvenient, and prejudicial to the interests of the Government as well as of the people, and strongly urges the necessity of the separation of the two services by the creation of a distinct Civil Medical Department recruited by open simultaneous competition in England and India.

Resolution VI.

Resolved that it is the opinion of this Congress that the principle embodied in the Foreign Telegraphic Press Messages Bill, now pending before the Supreme Legislative Council, is opposed to the policy followed by the British Government in India as to the unrestricted dissemination of useful knowledge and information, and that no adequate necessity is shown to exist for the passing of the proposed measure in British India.

Resolution VII.

Resolved that this Congress expresses its disapproval of the reactionary policy, subversive of local self-government, evidenced by the passing of the Calcutta Municipal Act, and by the introduction into the Legislative Council of Bombay of a similar measure which will have the effect of seriously jeopardising the principles of local self-government.

Resolution VIII.

Resolved that this Congress is of opinion that the rules prohibiting managers and teachers of aided institutions from taking part in political movements or attending political meetings without the consent of the Director of Public Instruction, or other authorities, are likely to interfere with the practical and effectual exercise of the rights of British subjects, to withdraw able and influential men from the cause of education, and to restrict private enterprise and organisation for the spread of education in this country. And this Congress hopes that the Madras and Bombay Governments will take steps to remove from the educational rules and the grant-in-aid code the provisions to the effect described above.

Resolution IX.

Resolved that this Congress is of opinion that stringent measures should be taken by the Government in granting licences to retail liquor shops, and that no such shops should be established anywhere in India without taking the sense of the inhabitants of the place.

NOW READY.

CONGRESS GREEN BOOK.—No. III.

The Proposed Separation of Judicial and Executive Duties in India.

MEMORIAL

FROM

RT. HON. LORD HOBHOUSE, K.C.S.I.
(late Legal Member of the Viceroy's Council, Member of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council).

RT. HON. SIR RICHARD GARTH, Q.C.
(late Chief Justice of Bengal).

RT. HON. SIR RICHARD COUCH
(late Chief Justice of Bengal, Member of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council).

SIR CHARLES SARGENT
(late Chief Justice of Bombay.)

SIR WILLIAM MARKBY, K.C.I.E.
(late Judge of the High Court, Calcutta).

SIR JOHN BUDD PHEAR
(late Judge of the High Court, Calcutta, and Chief Justice of Ceylon).

SIR JOHN SCOTT, K.C.M.G.
(late Judge of the High Court, Bombay).

SIR W. WEDDERBURN, BART., M.P.
(late Judge of the High Court, Bombay

SIR ROLAND K. WILSON, BART.
(late Reader in Indian Law at the University of Cambridge).

MR. HERBERT J. REYNOLDS, C.S.I.
(late Member of the Bengal Legislative Council).

TOGETHER WITH TWO APPENDICES.

LONDON: PUBLISHED BY THE BRITISH COMMITTEE OF THE INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS, 84 & 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, S.W.

Price One Shilling (or 12 annas), postage 2d. extra.

THE GRANHAMS, SHELFORD, CAMBRIDGE.

W. A. DOUGLAS RUDGE, B.A., 1st Class Natural Science Tripos, Scholar and Prizeman of St. John's College, receives gentlemen to prepare for "Little Go," Science Scholarships, and all University Examinations, also in Science for Indian Civil Service. Advice as to College and course of study furnished to gentlemen intending going to Cambridge. References kindly permitted by Romesh C. Dutt, Esq., C.I.E., and Dadabhai Naoroji, of London; and in India to B. C. Ghose, Esq., B.A., Ghaziaramandi, Lucknow, who will furnish further particulars.

To Political Associations, Literary Societies, Ethical Societies,

Etc., etc.

LECTURES and ADDRESSES ON INDIAN AFFAIRS.

The British Committee of the Indian National Congress (84 & 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, S.W.), is now making arrangements for lectures and addresses on Indian questions.

Associations or individuals that desire the services of thoroughly competent speakers on Indian questions are requested to communicate as early as may be with the Secretary to the British Committee at the above address. The services of a recent visitor to the Famine districts are available.

For a limited number of lectures lantern slides can be provided.

No charge will be made for the services of speakers with whom engagements are made through the British Committee.

Address, THE SECRETARY,
BRITISH COMMITTEE of the
INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS,
84 & 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, S.W.

DR. T. N. GHOSE'S

PECTORAL BALSAM.

A BOON TO SUFFERERS FROM ALL DISORDERS AND COMPLAINTS OF THE LUNGS AND CHEST.

For Cold in the Head, Coughs, Hoarseness, Asthma, Hooping Cough, Bronchitis, Sore Throat.

DR. W. VENOR says: "I have used it myself and prescribed it for many patients, and can very strongly recommend it for Bronchitis, Asthma, Indigestion. It will not cure Asthma or Indigestion, but a single dose I have found gives an immediate relief.—31st March, 1889.

P. C. GHOSE & CO., NEW MEDICAL HALL, MEERUT.

TRADE MARK,

is what its name implies FEVER DESTROYER,

and Cures Malarious, Intermittent and Remittent types of Fevers, Colds, etc.

North Raglan Barracks, Devonport.

I beg to enclose a cheque for the "Jvara-Hari." Both in India and Africa I have found it the BEST REMEDY FOR FEVER I know

C. E. WOOD, Capt. 22nd North Staffs. Regt.

"Jvara-Hari" is so efficacious on all fevers, that I now indent upon you for 4 dozen, per value payable parcel. I think there is more than magic in it.

G. L. NARSINGA ROW.

For INDIGESTION, DIARRHŒA, CHOLERA, etc., etc.

Cuddalore Municipal Councillors' Office.—"I ave much pleasure in stating that your "Omum-Carpoor" was found very useful for Cholera if taken in the early stage,

C. S. SRINIVASA, Chairman.

Omum-Carpoor TRADE MARK

Prices of "JVARA-HARI" and "OMUM-CARPOOR" 8 ans., Rs., 1/8 Rs., 2/12 Rs., and 11 Rs. per bottle. N.B.—1 doz. sent post free. To be had of all Chemists and Dealers, or of the Proprietors,

HENRY'S GREAT INDIAN REMEDIES COMPANY, 43, King William St., London, E.C., and 27, Second Line Beach, Madras.

JUST OUT. THE *HIGHLY SPOKEN OF.*

COMPREHENSIVE CRIMINAL DIGEST, 1862-1899.

By CHUNILAL HARILAL VAKIL, B.A., LL.B.,
Subordinate Judge, Dholka; First Class Magistrate, Ahmedabad.

This Digest contains all the criminal cases decided by the four High Courts and the unchartered High Courts in the Punjab, Oudh, Central Provinces, and Burma, reported in the four series of the Indian Law Reports, Bengal Law Reports, Madras H. C. Reports, Bombay H. C. Reports, N.W.P. High Court Reports, Calcutta Law Reports, Indian Jurist, Weekly Reporter, Haye's Reports, Hyde's Reports, Marshall's Reports, Coryton's Reports, Agra H. C. Reports, Moore's Indian Appeals, Criminal Rulings of the Bombay High Court, Calcutta Weekly Notes, Bombay Law Reporter, Joy Govind Shome's Reports, Bourke's Reports, Burma Select Judgments, Punjab Records, Central Provinces Reports, and Oudh Select cases, together with important cases from 1802 to 1862 decided by the **Sudder Fouzdaree Adawlut** and **Nizamut Adawlut.** It contains rulings from more than 300 volumes, while the greatest existing digest contains rulings from about 150 volumes only. It contains a complete index of all cases followed, overruled, or otherwise judicially noticed in these reports.

Price Rs. 17. Apply to THE COMPILER, DHOLKA.

The annual subscription to INDIA (post free) is nine shillings for England and six rupees for India. Subscriptions are payable in advance. Remittances, or communications relating to subscriptions or any other matter of business connected with INDIA, should in all cases be sent to the MANAGER *of INDIA, 84 and 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, London, S.W. In any communication regarding copies of INDIA circulated in India, it is requested that Subscribers be referred to both by name and by the number printed in each case upon the addressed wrapper.*

Cheques and Post Office Orders payable to W. DOUGLAS HALL.

Copies of INDIA can be obtained from the Offices of the Paper; from MR. ELLIOT STOCK, *Paternoster Row, London, E.C.; and to order at any Railway Bookstall.*

Printed by A. BONNER, 1 & 2, Took's Court, London, E.C., and Published for the Proprietors at 84 and 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, S.W.